Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 15 and 16 are all the claims pending in the application.

I.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In view of the Examiner's comments, Applicants note that claim 16 has been amended so as to indicate that the program is recorded on a "non-transitory" computer-readable recording medium, thereby rendering claim 16 statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. Accordingly, Applicants request that the above-noted rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

II.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Conkwright et al. (US 2002/0133490) and Juneau (US 2005/0108529), and further in view of Leung et al. (US 2002/0095673).

Claim 1, as amended, recites the features of a function processing unit operable to activate and terminate a camera function based on a user's operation; and a judging unit operable to judge that the broadcast contents should not be displayed when the camera function is activated, and to judge that the broadcast contents should be displayed when the camera function is terminated; wherein said function processing unit is further operable to cause, when the camera function has been activated, said display unit to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while said outline presentation unit presents the outline, so that the presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously, the function processing image being generated by the camera function and being

different from the outline.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted combination of features recited in amended claim 1 for at least the following reasons.

Regarding the above-noted features recited in claim 1, Applicants note that claim 1 previously utilized the phrase "a predetermined function", and defined the predetermined function as "being one of an e-mail function, a calling function, a JAVA application function, a web browser function, and a camera function".

In the Office Action, the Examiner took the position that the parental controls function in the Kwoh reference, which enables a user to prevent certain broadcast contents from being displayed, corresponded to the claimed "predetermined function" (e.g., see Office Action at page 4), and that the Juneau reference disclosed a parental controls function in the form of a JAVA application function (e.g., see Office Action at page 5).

By the present amendment, as noted above, claim 1 has been amended herein so as to replace each instance of the phrase "predetermined function" with --camera function--.

Based on the foregoing, it is noted that while Kwoh discloses a parental control system in which a user is able to block/allow certain broadcast contents from being displayed, and Juneau discloses the use of a parental control system and applying JAVA, Applicants respectfully submit that Kwoh and Juneau do not render obvious the above-noted combination of features recited in amended claim 1 of a function processing unit operable to activate and terminate a camera function based on a user's operation; and a judging unit operable to judge that the broadcast contents should not be displayed when the camera function is activated, and to judge that the broadcast contents should be displayed when the camera function is terminated; wherein said

11

function processing unit is further operable to cause, <u>when the camera function has been</u> <u>activated</u>, said display unit to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while said outline presentation unit presents the outline, so that the presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously, <u>the</u> <u>function processing image being generated by the camera function</u> and being different from the outline.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Conkwright and Leung do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Kwoh and Juneau. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 3-5 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Applicants note that each of these claims has been amended in a similar manner as claim 1 so as to recite the features of a function processing step of activating and terminating a <u>camera function</u> based on a user's operation; and a judging step of judging that the broadcast contents should not be displayed <u>when the camera function is</u> <u>activated</u>, and judging that the broadcast contents should be displayed <u>when the camera function</u> <u>is terminated</u>, wherein in said function processing step, <u>when the camera function has been</u> <u>activated</u>, the display unit is caused to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while the outline is presented in said outline presentation step, so that the presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously, <u>the function processing image being generated by the camera function</u> and being different from the outline.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants

respectfully submit that the combination of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright and Leung does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claims 15 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Juneau (US 2005/0108529), Conkwright et al. (US 2002/0133490) and Leung et al. (US 2002/0095673), and further in view of Tsukagoshi (US 5,684,542).

Claim 6 depends from claim 1. Applicants submit that Tsukagoshi fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright, and Leung, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency. Regarding claim 13, as noted above, this claim has been canceled by this amendment.

C. Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Juneau (US 2005/0108529), Conkwright et al. (US 2002/0133490) and Leung et al. (US 2002/0095673), and further in view of Palmer (US 5,195,135).

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. Applicants submit that Palmer fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright, and Leung, as discussed above, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

D. Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Juneau (US 2005/0108529), Conkwright et al. (US 2002/0133490) and Leung et al. (US 2002/0095673), and further in view of Lee et al. (US 2001/0049296).

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1. Applicants submit that Lee fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh, Juneau, Conkwright, and Leung, as discussed above, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 10 and 11 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kohei YAMAGUCHI et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/
By 2010.07.27 14:47:45 -04'00'
_____
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krg
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 27, 2010